

SECRET

This document consists of 3 pages

No. 1 of 9 Copies, Series A

Office Memorandum • UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

TO : RA - Mr. Timmons

FROM : RA - Russell Fessenden *RF*

DATE: April 15, 1949

*Pl. respond to my questions.**RF**AM**WLS**MT**BLT*

SUBJECT: Coordinating Meeting of the U.S. Element Standing Group, April 14

1. Second Generation IRBM Working Group

The Standing Group is not planning to answer certain questions which have been asked by the Working Group on second generation IRBMs for their April 21-23 meeting.

2. MC 82/2 - Role of the Military in Coordinated Research and Production

The Military Committee has approved MC 82/2, with the Netherlands and Denmark reserving on the grounds that they had not yet received full national guidance. Accordingly, the document has been transmitted to SGREP. His instructions, however, are such that he will not forward the document to the NAC until the Dutch and Danish reservations have been lifted. The NAC will be asked to approve the concept set forth in MC 82/2 and to accept the procedure. The U.S. Element believes that Meili supports the concept, but difficulty is expected with Moreau.

3. Location of IRBM Squadrons

SACEUR is expected within ten days to inform the NAC on the location of IRBM squadrons. In response to my question, I was told that the request to SACEUR for this information arose in the context of NAC discussion of multilateral financing for IRBM sites.

4. French Fleet Withdrawal

SACEUR indicated April 9 that he would transmit his comments within ten days on the implications of the French fleet withdrawal. The major difficulty has been in connection with the forces which are earmarked for NATO but not assigned to any particular command. SACLANT's comments have already been transmitted and the French in the SG have indicated informally that they have no problems with SACLANT's comments. It is to be expected that the Standing Group will comment to the Council by the end of the month, provided no major difficulties develop with respect to national positions.

5. Rules of Engagement and Integrated Air Defense

SHAPE is giving high priority to completing the so-called "rules of engagement." The problem of how to present this to the NAC is proving a very complicated one.

SECRET

CLASSIFIED
AUTHORITY <i>NND 837424</i>
By <i>ER</i> Date <i>2/14/90</i>

SECRET

- 2 -

There are some 35 to 40 different identification measures which can hardly be submitted in their totality to the NAC. The probability is that the NAC will be asked to approve the concept in principle, with the military then left to work out the specific procedures. It was noted that the French approach has not been directed against the basic concept of the military's authority to fire, but rather against MC 66 as being too limited in scope.

6. MC 70

*RM-
WS-
on file
in file* The IPT has completed its review of forces for 1962 and 1963, and the U.S. guidance thereon has been satisfactorily worked in during the process. The Commanders have been asked for their review of 1964 forces by June 1. The IPT is not treating this exercise as a formal revision of MC 70 or labeling it as corrigenda or changes in MC 70 force tables. It will, for the time being, simply be treated as guidance for the 1959 AR.

7. 1959 Annual Review Procedure

The Questionnaire is expected within two weeks. The resolution on the 1959 Annual Review is being withheld for the time being.

8. Defense Resolution

The Standing Group's meeting with SACEUR and SACLANT was described as a useful one. The Standing Group's general approach is that, before it can develop a position, it must obtain information on a number of unknown factors both from the military commanders and from the Secretary-General. Hence the meeting with Spaak scheduled for the 18th will be largely a listening brief, during which the Standing Group will seek to learn Spaak's point of view, just as they had earlier done with SACEUR and SACLANT. The Standing Group will then formulate a military position for Spaak's consideration to be presented to him when they go to Paris around April 21 or 22.


9. Expediting New Infrastructure Projects

Consideration is being given to proposing that nations can use funds for planning purposes immediately after a military commander has recommended a given project. There will be provision for reimbursement if a project is knocked out after a military commander has recommended proceeding.

10. Infrastructure Criteria for Thor IRBMs

The IMPT has drawn up a paper establishing infrastructure criteria for the Thor IRBM. To meet the French, a covering statement makes clear that the question of multilateral financing of IRBMs is not prejudiced by the paper.

SECRET



SECRET

- 3 -

MJT-
?
B47

11. Forward Scatter

The Standing Group has received a message from SACEUR indicating that he has canceled the Paris-to-Oslo link in the forward scatter system on the grounds that there are insufficient funds. This is a cause of some bewilderment to the SG because the Paris-Oslo link is one of the most important in the forward scatter system. It is possible that SACEUR ordered this action as a means of pressuring the French to be more forthcoming in the forward scatter problem.

12. IRBMs for Greece and Turkey

ISA stated that the proposed authority to General Norstad to proceed with IRBM negotiations for Greece and Turkey was "being held up by State for various political and financial reasons." I pointed out that Mr. Murphy had made the State position on this clear to Mr. Quarles last Saturday.

13. Courses of Action in Berlin Problem

ISA reported that there were two papers developed jointly by State, Defense and CIA on military and non-military courses of action to be taken if the Soviets turn over control to the GDR and our access to Berlin is impeded. ISA said that these two papers are being carried by Capt. McDaniel to Paris and will be shown to General Norstad on a purely U.S. Eyes Only basis for his comments. It is then proposed that the papers be sent to the President for final approval and subsequently be sent back to General Norstad as his basic guidance for the tripartite planning which he is to conduct as CINCEUR with the British and French. ISA pointed out that these two papers are fully agreed between State and Defense except for one issue as yet unresolved, which related to the covering memorandum. State takes the position that there should be graduated implementation of the various military and non-military measures, going from the less severe to the more severe. The Defense position is that such a graduated implementation might consume an excessive period of time and make more difficult the process of obtaining general support for whatever military actions may become necessary.

14. NATO Meeting

I described briefly the NATO meeting and the Council's tour. I said that both the Tenth Anniversary ceremony and the Council tour had been successful, and expressed appreciation for all that the Department of Defense and the services had done to make this possible.

cc: USRO - Mr. Wolf
RA - Mr. Magill
Mr. Compton
Mr. Smith
Miss Tibbetts
Mr. Black

EUR/RA:RFessenden:cnc

SECRET

NO. 887424
DATE 2/14/90